

AMC FILE COPY

AD A100975

Research Report 1243

LEVEL

(X)

(B)

6  
14) ~~15~~ APR 1981  
TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD  
ONE STATION AND TWO STATION  
INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING.

15) ~~16~~ APR 1981  
Tomme R. Actkinson

16) ~~26~~ APR 1981

5

ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS

DTIC  
SELECTED  
JUL 7 1981  
S D  
F



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

(11)

Feb [redacted] 80

(12)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

81 7 06 068

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the  
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

---

JOSEPH ZEIDNER  
Technical Director

FRANKLIN A. HART  
Colonel, US Army  
Commander

---

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI TP, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333.

FINAL DISPOSITION This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Report 1243	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD ONE STATION AND TWO STATION INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report
7. AUTHOR(s) Atkinson, Tomme R.		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (PERI-OH) 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q163743A775
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity Fort Hood, TX 76544		12. REPORT DATE February 1980
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 31
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Initial Entry Training (IET) Attitudes Two Station Training One Station Unit Training (OSUT)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Trainees and instructors were queried as to their attitudes toward two initial entry training strategies (IET). The two training strategies employed were One Station Unit Training (OSUT) and Two Station Training (TST). OSUT was conducted solely at Ft. Benning, Ga. TST was conducted at two locations with the first seven weeks of training at Ft. Knox, Ky. and the last five weeks at Ft. Benning, Ga. Analysis of results showed that TST trainee attitudes improved throughout training, and that by the end of IET TST trainees had		

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

20. significantly more positive attitudes than did OSUT trainees. Instructor results were mixed. However, OSUT instructors indicated they felt that the length of time between cycle breaks was too long.

**Research Report 1243**

**TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD  
ONE STATION AND TWO STATION  
INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING**

Tomme R. Actkinson

Submitted by:  
George M. Gividen, Chief  
ARI FIELD UNIT AT FORT HOOD, TEXAS

Approved by:  
James D. Baker, Acting Director  
ORGANIZATIONS AND SYSTEMS  
RESEARCH LABORATORY

**U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333**

**Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel  
Department of the Army**

**February 1980**

---

Army Project Number  
2Q163743A775

Human Performance  
in Field Assessment

**Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.**

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

<b>Accession For</b>	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Justification</b>	
By _____	
<b>Distribution/</b>	
<b>Availability Codes</b>	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

FOREWORD

The Fort Hood Field Unit of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) provides support to Headquarters, TCATA (TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity). One aspect of this support concerns the field evaluation of new training systems.

From July 1975 to August 1976, the Army conducted a test to determine if one station unit training (OSUT) sufficiently prepared soldiers to perform initial duties upon joining a unit. The design and execution of the test was criticized by the General Accounting Office and by Congress. Congress accepted the fact that initial entry training (IET) could be reduced from 16 to 12 weeks; however, it directed that the Army conduct a test to determine whether or not the same 12-week program could be conducted as effectively at two stations as at one station. ARI assisted TCATA in the OSUT/TST test by providing technical advisory services and through assessing the effects of training programs on trainee/cadre attitudes. This report presents the results of that attitude assessment.

  
JOSEPH ZEIDNER  
Technical Director

TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD ONE STATION AND TWO STATION INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING

BRIEF

---

Requirement:

To measure and evaluate trainee and instructor attitudes towards the one-station and two-station Initial Entry Training (IET) strategies.

Procedure:

Trainees received a 31-item attitude questionnaire at the 3rd, 6th, and 11th weeks of training. An additional 7-item questionnaire was administered during the eleventh training week. Between-group attitudinal comparisons were computed at each point via chi square analyses. Additionally, trend analyses were computed within the OSUT/TST groups.

Instructor cadre personnel received a 19-item questionnaire during the 6th and 11th weeks of training. Between and within group comparisons were computed in the same manner as for the trainees.

Findings:

Two station trainees' attitudes became progressively more positive while OSUT trainees' attitudes became progressively more negative.

Instructor cadre questionnaires yielded mixed results. However OSUT cadre felt that their cycle breaks occurred after too long an interval.

Utilization of Findings:

The TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity (TCATA) has utilized the findings of this report in TCATA Test Report FT 423 "Two Station Training." This report should also prove useful to the Army in ongoing reviews of initial entry training concepts.

TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES TOWARD ONE STATION AND TWO STATION INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
METHOD . . . . .	1
Subjects . . . . .	1
Procedures . . . . .	2
Questionnaires . . . . .	2
Analyses . . . . .	2
RESULTS . . . . .	2
DISCUSSION . . . . .	4
Trainee Questionnaire . . . . .	4
End of Training Trainee Questionnaire . . . . .	5
Cadre Questionnaire . . . . .	5
Possible Areas of Future Research . . . . .	7
CONCLUSION . . . . .	7
APPENDIXES A. OSUT/TST Attitude Questionnaires . . . . .	A-1
B. Statistical Analyses . . . . .	B-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of questions answered more positively toward TST or OSUT . . . . .	2
2. Number of questions showing significant trends in attitude responses . . . . .	3
3. Cadre response to cycle breaks . . . . .	6
4. Cadre perceptions of cadre/trainee relationships after 6 and 12 weeks of training . . . . .	7

TRAINEE & INSTRUCTOR ATTITUDES  
TOWARD ONE STATION AND TWO STATION  
INITIAL ENTRY TRAINING

INTRODUCTION

Initial entry training (IET) is the process by which a civilian is turned into a soldier and taught those duties and skills necessary for his first duty assignment. Until the early 1970s IET consisted of two distinct portions, basic training and advanced training, which were usually conducted at separate installations. In an effort to reduce resource requirements, the Army developed and implemented a One Station Training concept (OST) in which the plan of instruction was integrated at one location into a shorter combined version of basic and advanced initial training. OST later developed into one station unit training or OSUT.

In 1975 Congress directed the Army to test the training effectiveness and efficiency of OSUT versus the alternative of training begun at one station and completed at another (called two station training or TST). Both approaches were to use the shortened OSUT plan of instruction. The TRADOC Combined Arms Test Activity (TCATA) was designated as test activity for the training effectiveness portion of the OSUT/TST test. TCATA was assisted in the test by the Fort Hood Field Unit of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI). ARI primarily assisted by developing the attitude questionnaires for the trainees and instructor cadre, and through analysis and interpretation of questionnaire data.<sup>1</sup> This report covers the findings of the OSUT/TST attitudinal questionnaires.<sup>2</sup>

METHOD

Subjects. Between 1300 and 1600 OSUT and TST trainees answered the attitude questionnaire during the third, sixth and eleventh weeks of training. Due to trainee attrition the number of participants was different at each questionnaire application point.

<sup>1</sup>Thanks are expressed to the members of the TCATA OSUT/TST test teams who administered the questionnaires and to Major Joe Smith and Captain Chet Houser of the Training Directorate and Margie Day of the Instrumentation and Automated Data Processing Directorate (TCATA) for their assistance in the data analysis.

<sup>2</sup>For a fuller discussion of the OSUT/TST test see TCATA Test Report FT 423.

**Procedures.** OSUT trainees received 12 weeks of instruction at Fort Benning, Georgia. TST trainees received an initial 7 weeks of instruction at Fort Knox, Kentucky (Louisville) and were then moved to Fort Benning for their final five weeks of training. TST trainees therefore had exposure to two facilities and two sets of instructor cadre,\* whereas instructor cadre and facilities remained the same for OSUT trainees.

**Questionnaires.** Three attitude questionnaires were used (see Appendix A for complete questionnaires).

1. A 31 item trainee attitude questionnaire was administered to all TST/OSUT trainees during the 3rd, 6th, and 11th weeks of training. After preliminary analysis, questions 1, 18, and 20 were discarded from the evaluation which follows due to a lack of interpretability. (In all three cases it was impossible to ascertain the direction of favorable response.) Therefore results reported below are based on the 28 items retained.

2. An additional trainee attitude questionnaire consisting of 7 items was administered to all trainees in the 11th week of training.

3. Instructor cadre personnel received a 19 item questionnaire (3 background and 16 attitudinal items) during the 7th and 12th weeks of training.

**Analyses.** OSUT and TST attitudinal measures were compared for differences between groups via chi-square analyses of each question from the above three questionnaires. In addition a trend analysis was computed over the three, six and eleven week administration points for each question of the thirty-one item trainee questionnaire and the cadre questionnaire.

#### RESULTS

Frequency of response and detailed results of the statistical analyses are shown in Appendix B.

Table 1 shows the number of statistically significant questions from the trainee attitude questionnaire rated as being more positive by the TST or OSUT trainees.

Table 1. Number of Questions Answered More Positively Toward TST or OSUT

Training week	TST	OSUT
Third	2	4
Sixth	7	2
Eleventh	18	0

\*Instructor cadre refers mainly to drill sergeants and other personnel who dealt with the trainees on a daily basis.

Table 2 shows the direction of change for significant trends in trainee attitude responses.

Table 2. Number of Questions Showing Significant Trends In Attitude Responses

Type change	TST	OSUT
Positive	16	4
Negative	4	12

In addition to the above, trainee responses to the following items were found to be significantly different on the 7 item survey administered in the 11th week of training.

1. Of the TST trainees, 91.3% reported that the training received was useful or very useful compared to 88.3% of OSUT trainees ( $p<0.003$ ).
2. Of the TST trainees, 76.3% indicated that, on the average, fellow trainees in their companies were good or very good soldiers compared to 69.3% of the OSUT trainees ( $p<0.000$ ).
3. Of the TST trainees, 42.5% indicated that keeping the same instructor cadre for the entire period as being more, or much more, desirable compared to 73.5% of the OSUT trainees ( $p<0.000$ ).

Instructor cadre were also queried. Of 16 attitudinal questions the following 6 measures were statistically significant at the  $p<.05$  level.

1. At the end of the seventh week of training, 73.3% of the OSUT cadre reported reinforcement training (RT) lasting 1 hour or more as compared to 46.2% of the TST cadre ( $p<0.003$ ). At the twelfth week, 65.7% of the OSUT cadre reported more RT as compared to 28.5% of the TST cadre ( $p<0.000$ ).
2. At the end of the seventh week of training, 52.4% of the OSUT cadre reported more trainee counseling that lasted 1 hour or more as compared to 36.4% of the TST cadre ( $p<0.02$ ). At the twelfth week, 55.7% of the OSUT cadre reported more trainee counseling as compared to 37.3% of the TST cadre ( $p<0.04$ ).
3. At the end of the seventh week of training, 87.2% of the TST cadre reported satisfactory or very satisfactory relationships with their trainees as compared to 96.8% of the OSUT cadre ( $p<0.03$ ).

4. At the end of the twelfth week of training, 53.1% of the TST cadre indicated that obeying regulations and standard operating procedures was always or usually more important than getting the job done as compared to 69.8% of OSUT cadre ( $p<0.004$ ).

5. At the end of the twelfth week of training, 71.0% of TST cadre indicated that they were always or usually encouraged to think for themselves as compared to 59.5% of OSUT cadre ( $p<0.03$ ).

6. At the end of the twelfth week of training, 69.1% of TST cadre indicated that cycle breaks occurred about right, as compared to 35.8% of OSUT cadre. Fifty-six point six percent of the OSUT cadre indicated that cycle breaks occurred too late or way too late ( $p<0.000$ ).

#### DISCUSSION

**Trainee Questionnaire.** It is clear that a positive shift in attitude occurred for the TST group while a negative shift occurred for OSUT. This is shown both by Tables 1 and 2. What is less clear is when or why the change occurred. At the three week administration point 4 questions significantly favored OSUT and only 2 favored TST. However at the sixth week of training 7 questions significantly favored TST as opposed to 2 for OSUT. Thus the trend toward more positive TST attitudes may have been established prior to Phase II. If so, the final five weeks of training did nothing to change the direction of trainee response; for by the end of training there were 18 questions significantly in favor of TST, and none which favored OSUT. If the trend in attitudes favoring TST started prior to the sixth week, it not only continued, but accelerated.

Trend analyses of the questionnaire data (Table 2) indicated that the significant differences found were due to the OSUT trainees having less favorable attitudes over time while the TST trainee attitudes became more positive. Thus the number of positive trends for TST was four times that of OSUT (16 to 4) while the number of negative trends for OSUT was over three times that of TST (12 to 4).

The cause of the significant differences found may be due to a number of physical and psychological factors. Among possible explanations could be:

a. **Psychological.** Partial reinforcement from an intermediate goal state for TST trainees, that is, the trainees changing location know they will be leaving one environment, and getting to try something new. TST trainees, therefore, had a goal to anticipate at the 7 week point, whereas OSUT trainees had only the ultimate 11 week goal of graduation. If the "break" in training was seen as reinforcing, then this reinforcement may have contributed to the improvement in TST trainee attitudes.

b. Physical and Psychological. Trainees at Fort Knox, KY experienced severe weather (i.e., very cold) during the Jan-Mar 1979 time frame. Weather at Fort Benning was more moderate. While at first glance the more favorable weather at Fort Benning would have appeared to lend itself to more favorable attitudes on the part of OSUT trainees, adaptation level may have been of greater influence. Adaptation theory would suggest that when TST trainees moved from an unfavorable climate (e.g., cold at Knox) to a more favorable one at Benning, then they should experience a positive attitude change. An additional indication that this may have been a major contributor to trainee attitudes was independently offered by TCATA test officers, who stated that when they asked TST trainees at Fort Benning, "How's everything going?", they would typically get the following response, "Just fine sir, weather's great!"

From an attitude measurement standpoint it is unfortunate that the test could not continue through the summer. If adaptation level based on climate is one of the major determinants of the trainee attitudes we might expect quite different results when trainees had to move to a relatively unpleasant hot and humid Fort Benning.

c. Physical Program Differences. TST and OSUT trainees reported significant differences in the amount of sleep and free time at every questionnaire point. If true differences in sleep and free time existed, these differences could have led to more positive or negative ratings.

End of Training Trainee Questionnaire. The end of training questionnaire yielded two questions which showed significant differences positively favoring TST. As was indicated above, the more favorable responses may have been caused by a number of physical and psychological factors. Of interest on this questionnaire was the 3rd question on the advisability of keeping the same instructors throughout. OSUT trainees indicated that keeping the same instructor was desirable or very desirable (73.5%) to a much greater extent than did TST trainees (42.5%). One way of viewing the above is that the generally unfavorable attitudes held by OSUT trainees did not extend to their instructors. Another view might be that OSUT trainees did not wish to chance the unknown. At any rate there is reason to believe that instructor cadre can be changed without adversely affecting trainee moral.

Cadre Questionnaire. The instructor cadre comprised another large group of individuals surveyed during the OSUT/TST test. Their comments are of interest not only in providing direct assessments of the two training schemes, but also in that cadre comments often reinforced comments made by trainees. For example, the OSUT cadre reported significantly more time spent in reinforcement training and individual counseling than did TST cadre at both the seven and twelve week points. These findings would reinforce OSUT trainee comments of less free time in the evenings, and perhaps also the reports of less sleep. In addition, since there were two

contingents of TST cadre and only one OSUT cadre, it is interesting to note that less RT and counseling were given by the TST groups even after the change in TST cadre.

OSUT cadre also seemed less satisfied with their job situation than did TST cadre. OSUT cadre indicated less freedom to think and act for themselves, a requirement for strict adherence to procedures and rules, and too long a training period between cycle breaks.

Two possibly interrelated explanations seem likely. First, on the rules and S.O.P.s, there may have been actual differences as OSUT/TST trainees were assigned within different battalions at Fort Benning. That is, the battalion had either OSUT or TST companies, but not both. Battalion policy may have in fact differed, and caused lower job satisfaction for the OSUT cadre. Second, length of time between cycle breaks certainly contributed to lower OSUT cadre morale. TST cadre at Fort Benning received trainees in their 7th week of training, instructed for 6 weeks and were off for one. OSUT cadre received their trainees at week one of training and went 12 weeks before they got a break. Cadre answers to the question below were significant at the  $p < .0000$  level, with OSUT cadre perceiving their breaks as occurring at too long an interval.

Table 3. Cadre Response to Cycle Breaks

Cycle Breaks Occur	TST	OSUT
Way too early	.8	4.7
Too early	3.3	2.8
About right	69.1	35.8
Too late	8.1	34.6
Way too late	18.7	22.6

It is of interest that OSUT instructors indicated more satisfactory relationships with trainees at the six week point than did TST cadre. However, the finding of better trainee/cadre relationships for OSUT did not continue throughout training. In fact, as Table 4 shows, by the 12th week of training differences had disappeared and cadre reported relationships were virtually identical. A possible explanation for early OSUT reports of more satisfactory relationships could be in terms of commitment. OSUT cadre knew that they would have the same group of trainees for an additional six week period of time whereas TST trainees were about to depart for Fort Benning and phase II. Therefore OSUT cadre may have felt a stronger need to show a satisfactory relationship at this point.

Table 4. Cadre Perceptions of Cadre/Trainee Relationships  
after 6 and 12 weeks of Training

	7th Week		12th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
Very satisfactory	22.0	32.8	42.9	42.9
Satisfactory	65.2	64.0	52.1	52.4
Borderline	9.8	3.2	4.8	2.9
Unsatisfactory	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.9
Very Unsatisfactory	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Possible Areas of Future Research.** It is not yet clear what effects OSUT/TST trainee attitudes have on later job performance. If improved trainee attitudes in basic training can be shown to be predictive of better performance in later Army life (i.e., continued better attitudes, fewer article 15s and courtmartials, better retention rates, etc.), then the Army may want to consider more extensive studies into ways to positively influence attitudes of basic trainees.

An example of possibly fruitful future research would be adaptation level changes of a negative to positive nature. For example, if going from an unfavorable climate to a more favorable one causes a positive attitude shift, then perhaps trainees who start their IET in the north during the winter months could be shifted to a more favorable southern climate. Conversely, during the summer months, basic trainees who start in the south might finish IET in the north. In both cases it is hypothesized that the change in weather conditions would lead to an improvement in trainees' attitudes.

The above experiment could only occur if the Army reverts to TST. If OSUT remains as the standard Army policy, then similar negative to positive changes might occur on the same post. For example, trainees who initially live in older barracks might move to newer ones; go from older mess halls to newer ones; have less sleep and free time early in their training, and more later on, etc. Whether OSUT or TST is used for IET the influence on trainee attitudes of abrupt positive changes in trainee adaptation level appears warranted.

#### CONCLUSION

In conclusion, trainees trained at two stations had increasingly more positive attitudes than trainees trained at one station. More research into how to improve trainee attitudes and the effects of improved attitudes on later job performance is needed.

**Appendix A**

**OSUT/TST Attitude Questionnaires**

TABLE A-1 OSUT/TST THIRTY-ONE ITEM TRAINEE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE  
(Percent of Respondents)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	1ST	OSUT	1ST	OSUT	1ST	OSUT
1. Which of the following was the <u>most important</u> reason that you enlisted in the Army?						
a. Being a soldier is the kind of work I like.	14.9	13.2	16.7	15.0	17.7	16.7
b. For the travel and adventure.	14.2	14.7	16.3	16.7	17.6	19.2
c. Because the pay (including benefits) is better.	14.4	11.4	13.2	10.1	9.6	9.6
d. For job training or school education in the Army	37.4	39.3	37.2	38.6	37.7	38.2
e. For the retirement benefits.	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.9	2.4	1.8
f. None of the above.	16.6	18.6	13.8	16.7	14.9	14.5
2. The Army is:						
a. Very important for the defense of our country.	83.6	84.2	79.4	82.9	82.8	79.3
b. Important for the defense of our country.	9.5	8.5	14.2	11.2	12.4	12.9
c. Borderline.	2.8	2.3	3.6	2.7	3.1	5.1
d. Unimportant for the defense of our country.	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.8
e. Very unimportant for the defense of our country.	3.6	4.5	2.3	2.4	1.2	1.8
3. When I came on active duty, I was:						
a. Strongly considering making the Army a career.	27.1	25.4	25.4	23.9	21.5	21.2
b. Considering making the Army a career.	35.7	35.9	35.2	35.1	35.2	38.3
c. Borderline.	21.6	21.5	28.5	28.0	31.0	27.5
d. Opposed to making the Army a career.	9.6	11.7	7.3	8.9	8.2	9.6
e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career.	5.8	5.4	3.7	4.2	3.5	3.4
4. I am now:						
a. Strongly considering making the Army a career.	23.5	22.5	24.5	22.1	23.7	22.9
b. Considering making the Army a career.	34.8	36.5	35.4	36.6	33.6	34.2
c. Borderline.	27.8	26.9	29.2	29.4	32.3	31.3
d. Opposed to making the Army a career.	13.9	14.0	10.9	11.9	10.5	11.1
e. Strongly opposed to making the Army a career.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Since coming on active duty my opinion of the Army:						
a. Has become much more favorable.	19.5	20.6	22.8	20.9	22.9	21.3
b. Has become more favorable.	30.3	28.6	32.2	32.7	36.0	34.2
c. Has not changed.	30.9	31.9	29.4	30.2	27.4	29.3
d. Has become less favorable.	12.5	13.5	12.1	10.9	9.7	10.0
e. Has become much less favorable.	6.9	5.4	3.6	5.3	4.9	5.2

Table A-1 (Cont'd)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
6. When the opportunity arises, how likely is it that you will reenlist in the Army?						
a. Very likely.	25.2	22.9	23.8	21.8	22.0	21.6
b. Likely.	32.2	35.1	32.8	32.5	32.3	34.7
c. Borderline.	22.3	22.8	25.7	26.7	27.5	24.1
d. Unlikely.	10.4	10.3	8.9	10.7	10.8	10.0
e. Very unlikely.	9.9	8.9	8.8	8.3	7.3	9.6
7. Compared to places where I could work in civilian life, the Army is:						
a. Much better.	23.7	23.4	22.2	19.1	20.3	18.9
b. Better.	31.0	29.3	30.0	31.7	29.9	31.1
c. About the same.	26.8	28.8	28.9	27.7	29.7	29.4
d. Worse.	13.7	13.7	14.0	16.0	16.3	15.5
e. Much worse.	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.6	4.8	4.7
8. Should you recommend to a civilian friend of yours that he enlist in the Army?						
a. Strongly recommend he enlist.	25.8	24.8	24.8	21.1	24.7	25.1
b. Recommend he enlist.	42.2	42.0	39.6	39.4	38.8	38.6
c. Borderline.	24.8	25.5	28.1	31.8	29.9	28.9
d. Recommend he not enlist.	7.1	7.6	7.5	7.7	6.5	7.4
e. Strongly recommend he not enlist.						
9. In my unit, there is:						
a. Almost continual harassment of soldiers.	11.8	12.1	9.2	11.8	10.2	12.3
b. Much harassment of soldiers.	19.6	15.9	19.5	15.2	15.2	16.7
c. Some harassment of soldiers.	33.9	34.1	32.4	33.4	31.0	35.1
d. Very little harassment of soldiers.	23.7	24.6	27.2	25.8	27.8	24.8
e. No harassment of soldiers.	11.1	13.3	11.7	13.8	15.8	11.0
10. In my unit the standards of <u>military courtesy</u> are:						
a. Very high.	35.0	39.1	31.5	36.5	38.9	36.3
b. High.	31.4	32.5	41.7	35.7	41.7	40.4
c. Borderline.	19.4	19.9	20.1	20.1	16.5	17.9
d. Low.	5.4	6.1	5.2	5.9	3.4	3.4
e. Very low.	2.9	2.3	1.4	1.8	1.5	2.0

Table A-1 (Cont'd)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
11. In my unit the standards of discipline are:						
a. Very high.	34.6	38.2	32.0	33.6	36.5	34.9
b. High.	37.8	32.9	40.6	36.6	39.7	37.9
c. Borderline.	18.2	19.5	20.8	21.0	18.2	18.7
d. Low.	7.3	5.2	5.2	7.0	4.4	5.7
e. Very low.	1.9	2.1	1.4	1.9	1.1	2.8
12. In my unit I am:						
a. Always treated like a man.	42.2	46.1	43.2	42.1	51.2	40.8
b. Usually treated like a man.	33.5	31.7	36.0	35.5	32.5	35.7
c. Borderline.	15.9	15.0	15.0	15.6	12.1	16.6
d. Usually treated like a child.	5.8	5.6	4.2	5.1	2.9	5.5
e. Always treated like a child.	2.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.5
13. During my training my morale has usually been:						
a. Very high.	26.2	25.7	27.4	27.6	31.4	28.9
b. High.	43.0	44.9	46.7	46.6	46.0	45.8
c. Borderline.	22.1	21.4	18.8	18.6	16.9	18.8
d. Low.	5.6	5.1	4.8	5.1	3.6	4.4
e. Very low.	3.1	2.9	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.1
14. Being a soldier in the US Army makes me:						
a. Very proud.	52.7	53.7	52.5	51.0	56.4	49.4
b. Proud.	29.3	30.1	30.9	33.3	31.4	33.3
c. Neither proud nor ashamed.	15.3	14.5	14.6	13.5	10.9	15.6
d. Ashamed.	1.6	1.0	1.4	1.5	0.4	1.1
e. Very ashamed.	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.5
15. On the whole, how is the morale in your company?						
a. Very high.	18.9	15.8	21.0	19.1	26.8	25.7
b. High.	41.6	41.8	43.4	45.1	47.5	44.1
c. Borderline.	31.0	32.1	28.4	27.1	21.2	22.8
d. Low.	6.6	8.4	5.3	7.0	3.4	5.7
e. Very low.	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.0	1.5

Table A-1 (Cont 'd)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
16. Most NCO's that I know are:						
a. Very understanding of their men's needs.	29.6	29.0	31.7	29.3	42.5	31.0
b. Understanding of their men's needs.	39.2	41.9	41.9	40.7	37.4	41.1
c. Borderline.	19.7	21.2	19.9	21.3	15.7	18.9
d. Nonunderstanding of their men's needs.	7.8	7.7	4.8	5.8	3.0	5.8
e. Very nonunderstanding of their men's needs.	3.6	3.0	2.5	3.0	1.6	3.1
17. If I had a personal problem and needed help from my <u>drill instructor</u> , he would probably be:						
a. Very helpful.	46.8	47.0	48.8	42.8	57.5	40.1
b. Helpful.	31.5	33.0	32.8	35.1	28.6	35.1
c. Borderline.	12.5	13.5	12.8	14.6	8.8	16.6
d. Unhelpful.	4.7	3.9	2.9	4.9	3.5	5.1
e. Very unhelpful.	4.5	2.5	2.8	2.6	1.6	3.1
18. Approximately how much time on an average training day does your [br]11) Sergeant spend counselling or giving informal instruction to your platoon as a unit?						
a. None.	6.8	5.8	7.2	6.2	5.5	7.8
b. 1 hour.	22.2	16.5	29.1	24.4	21.4	26.8
c. 2 hours.	24.0	20.5	26.1	25.2	25.2	24.2
d. 3 hours.	13.1	14.4	14.0	14.8	17.4	14.8
e. Over 3 hours.	33.8	42.8	22.7	28.5	30.4	26.3
19. In general how qualified are instructors who are in charge of your training?						
a. Very qualified.	61.9	68.6	60.4	62.2	65.1	55.7
b. Qualified.	28.5	23.8	29.6	28.0	27.1	32.4
c. Borderline.	7.2	5.6	7.8	7.7	6.0	8.5
d. Unqualified.	1.3	1.2	1.6	1.2	1.1	2.1
e. Very unqualified.	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.7	1.2
20. How many times were you counseled (talked to) by your drill Sergeant when it was just you and he discussing some <u>personal</u> subject or problem?						
a. Never.	39.4	35.4	33.3	30.8	36.6	29.4
b. Less than 3 times.	42.1	46.9	44.0	45.2	41.8	43.2
c. 3-5 times.	13.4	13.0	16.4	16.9	16.3	18.7
d. 6-8 times.	2.6	2.8	3.2	4.0	3.0	4.3
e. Over 8 times.	2.5	1.9	3.1	3.2	3.3	4.4

Table A-1 (Cont'd)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
21. In regard to keeping you informed about training events and policies, drill sergeants in my unit:						
a. Do a very good job.	55.4	55.5	48.2	47.7	58.1	39.6
b. Do a good job.	29.0	30.1	33.6	34.4	29.5	38.3
c. Borderline.	10.9	10.8	12.5	13.0	9.3	13.9
d. Do a poor job.	2.8	2.4	4.1	2.8	2.4	5.6
e. Do a very poor job.	1.9	1.2	1.5	2.2	0.7	2.4
22. Most Army officers that I know are:						
a. Very understanding of their men's needs.	32.7	34.6	33.5	36.0	38.9	31.4
b. Understanding of their men's needs.	39.1	31.6	42.1	39.5	37.7	39.1
c. Borderline.	20.6	20.5	19.0	19.1	18.0	23.7
d. Nonunderstanding of their men's needs.	4.8	5.5	3.2	3.7	3.4	4.2
e. Very nonunderstanding of their men's needs.	2.7	1.9	2.1	1.8	2.0	1.5
23. If I had a personal problem and needed help from my <u>company commander</u> , he would probably be:						
a. Very helpful.	46.5	52.0	49.5	51.6	49.6	44.9
b. Helpful.	34.8	31.8	31.9	29.7	31.1	32.4
c. Borderline.	13.5	11.4	13.0	14.6	13.2	16.3
d. Unhelpful.	3.7	3.2	3.8	2.9	3.9	4.3
e. Very unhelpful.	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.2	2.1	2.1
24. The Army is:						
a. Very concerned for me as an individual soldier.	32.4	34.8	32.1	28.1	31.2	27.3
b. Concerned for me as an individual soldier.	38.2	35.4	40.6	38.6	41.0	36.8
c. Borderline.	20.5	20.3	19.7	23.8	20.9	24.7
d. Unconcerned for me as an individual soldier.	6.4	6.0	4.9	5.7	4.8	7.9
e. Very unconcerned for me as an individual soldier.	2.5	3.6	2.6	3.7	2.1	3.3
25. The Army has treated me:						
a. Very fairly.	34.1	34.6	34.7	32.9	36.8	30.4
b. Fairly.	43.7	45.4	46.9	46.3	44.7	45.6
c. Borderline.	15.9	14.0	12.7	14.6	13.1	18.1
d. Unfairly.	4.3	4.0	3.6	4.7	3.6	3.8
e. Very unfairly.	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.1

Table A-1 (Cont'd)

Question	3d Week		6th Week		11th Week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
26. The training I have received to date has been:						
a. Very challenging.	43.0	48.9	43.3	50.8	51.6	44.9
b. Challenging.	40.9	36.9	39.5	36.1	37.4	40.0
c. Borderline.	10.6	10.3	12.6	6.5	8.4	11.2
d. Unchallenging.	4.0	2.8	3.0	2.2	1.7	2.6
e. Very unchallenging.	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.4	0.8	1.4
27. The pace of training is:						
a. Much too fast.	8.7	7.8	7.9	9.4	9.2	9.5
b. Too fast.	17.6	16.9	17.0	19.0	15.5	18.2
c. About right.	63.8	67.0	66.0	64.6	68.0	63.7
d. Too slow.	8.1	7.0	6.2	5.4	5.6	6.4
e. Much too slow.	1.9	1.3	2.9	1.5	1.7	2.1
28. Do you feel there is enough time to complete the training in the scheduled time periods?						
a. Yes - all the time.	31.4	31.0	30.9	31.6	36.2	31.9
b. Yes - most of the time.	47.0	48.4	48.2	45.2	44.0	42.8
c. Borderline - about half the time.	16.5	14.9	16.4	17.4	15.5	18.2
d. No - seldom.	3.7	4.1	2.8	4.2	3.0	4.6
e. No - never.	1.4	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.2	2.5
29. How many extra hours per week (after normal duty hours, during weekends, etc.) were spent catching up on missed training or to cover training which your Drill Sergeant considered important?						
a. Less than 2 hours.	49.2	49.5	41.8	39.8	40.1	41.6
b. 2-4 hours.	30.3	31.8	33.8	33.4	30.9	30.9
c. 5-7 hours.	11.4	11.6	15.8	14.6	15.3	16.3
d. 7-10 hours.	4.0	3.1	4.3	7.2	6.4	5.3
e. Over 10 hours.	5.1	4.1	4.3	6.9	4.7	5.9
30. Approximately how much free time in the evenings do you have on an average training day?						
a. Less than 30 minutes.	23.6	32.3	20.6	30.3	14.7	25.1
b. 1 hour.	35.8	42.6	33.3	39.9	28.8	40.3
c. 2 hours.	26.2	16.1	26.6	18.7	33.4	21.6
d. 3 hours.	10.3	6.1	14.3	7.2	16.6	9.0
e. Over 3 hours.	4.0	2.9	5.0	3.9	6.4	3.8
31. How many hours of sleep do you get on an average workday night?						
a. 4 hours or less.	5.7	8.5	7.2	19.1	8.6	22.6
b. 5 hours.	17.9	21.5	19.1	27.7	29.6	29.6
c. 6 hours.	30.2	33.1	32.0	30.7	31.1	28.4
d. 7 hours.	36.7	29.5	33.8	18.3	32.2	15.7
e. 8 or more hours.	9.6	7.3	8.0	4.2	7.3	3.8

TABLE A-2 OSUT/TST SEVEN ITEM TRAINEE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE  
(Percent of Respondents)

Question	TSI	11th week	OSUT
1. The training I have received has been:			
a. Very useful in preparing me to work in my MOS	64.8	56.8	
b. Useful in preparing me to work in my MOS	26.5	29.5	
c. Borderline	7.0	6.9	
d. Useless in preparing me to work in my MOS	1.3	1.3	
e. Very useless in preparing me to work in my MOS	0.4	1.5	
2. On an average, fellow trainees in my unit are:			
a. Very good soldiers	26.0	20.8	
b. Good soldiers	50.3	48.5	
c. Borderline	19.4	24.2	
d. Poor soldiers	4.4	4.2	
e. Very poor soldiers	1.0	2.2	
3. Keeping the same cadre for the entire initial entry training program was:			
a. Very desirable	22.4	30.1	
b. Desirable	20.1	43.4	
c. Of no importance	27.8	18.3	
d. Undesirable	13.4	4.2	
e. Very undesirable	16.3	3.9	
4. The length of initial entry training is 12 weeks, in your opinion it should be:			
a. Increased by two weeks	13.9	16.6	
b. Increased by one week	12.5	10.4	
c. Unchanged	53.6	56.0	
d. Decreased by one week	8.9	7.4	
e. Decreased by two weeks	11.1	11.6	
5. The coverage of subjects concerned with <u>basic</u> soldiering was:			
a. Much more than needed	15.9	16.7	
b. More than needed	18.0	17.6	
c. About right	56.1	55.7	
d. Less than needed	6.8	7.4	
e. Much less than needed	3.1	2.6	

Table A-2 (Cont'd)

Question	11th week OSUT	
	T <sub>2</sub> 1	T <sub>2</sub> 2
6. The coverage of subject concerned with my MUS was:		
a. Much more than needed	16.2	16.2
b. More than needed	17.8	16.1
c. About right	51.8	53.6
d. Less than needed	10.0	10.0
e. Much less than needed	4.2	4.2
7. Would you like to have in your next unit the same trainees with whom you are now training?		
a. Definitely yes	21.8	21.8
b. Probably yes	24.0	22.6
c. Doesn't make any difference	22.6	22.3
d. Probably not	10.7	12.4
e. Definitely not	19.0	19.9

TABLE A-3 OSUT/TST INSTRUCTOR CADRE ATTITUDE SURVEY  
(Percent of Respondents)

Question	7th week		12th week	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
1. How long have you been assigned to this unit?				
a. Less than 1 month	6.1	0.8	0.8	1.9
b. 1-6 mos	14.4	22.4	20.2	17.8
c. 7-12 mos	38.6	36.0	29.0	38.3
d. 13-18 mos	18.9	20.0	32.3	24.3
e. 19-24 mos	9.8	12.0	13.7	10.3
f. 25-30 mos	3.0	8.0	2.4	6.5
g. More than 30 mos	9.1	0.8	1.6	0.9
2. What is your marital status?				
a. Widowed	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0
b. Divorced	3.8	1.6	8.7	3.7
c. Single	8.3	9.8	7.1	10.3
d. Married	76.5	81.3	80.2	77.6
e. Separated but not divorced	5.3	1.6	2.4	0.9
f. Remarried (i.e., on second/third marriage because of divorce, being widowed, etc.)	5.3	4.9	1.6	7.5
3. Your age is:				
a. 17-20	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.9
b. 21-24	12.1	8.0	6.3	8.4
c. 25-28	27.3	33.6	28.6	31.8
d. 29-32	30.3	28.0	33.3	27.1
e. 33-36	15.9	21.6	23.0	19.6
f. 37-40	11.6	5.6	7.9	10.3
g. Over 40	2.3	3.2	0.8	1.9
4. On an average training day, how much time did you spend giving your trainees reinforcement training?				
a. Less than 30 minutes	22.3	10.0	32.5	8.8
b. 30 minutes to 1 hour	31.5	16.7	39.0	25.5
c. 1 to 1 1/2 hours	19.2	31.7	11.4	26.5
d. 1 1/2 to 2 hours	14.6	20.0	7.3	14.7
e. 2 to 2 1/2 hours	6.9	12.5	3.3	9.8
f. 2 1/2 to 3 hours	1.5	5.0	1.6	8.8
g. Over 3 hours	3.8	4.2	4.2	5.9

Table A-3 (Cont'd)

Question	7th week Phase 1		12th week Phase 2	
	TST	OSUT	TST	OSUT
5. On an average training day, how much time did you spend on opportunity training?				
a. Less than 30 minutes	43.1	34.4	37.1	26.5
b. 30 minutes to 1 hour	40.8	38.7	40.3	49.0
c. 1 to 1 1/2 hours	11.5	15.1	9.7	16.7
d. 1 1/2 to 2 hours	3.1	6.7	6.5	2.9
e. 2 to 2 1/2 hours	0.8	3.4	4.0	2.0
f. 2 1/2 to 3 hours	0.0	0.8	1.6	0.0
g. Over 3 hours	0.8	0.8	0.8	2.9
6. On an average training day, how much time did you spend giving individual counseling?				
a. Less than 30 minutes	19.7	12.9	14.3	17.9
b. 30 minutes to 1 hour	43.9	34.7	48.4	26.4
c. 1 to 1 1/2 hours	15.2	20.2	19.8	34.9
d. 1 1/2 to 2 hours	10.6	16.1	8.7	9.4
e. 2 to 2 1/2 hours	4.5	10.5	6.4	7.5
f. 2 1/2 to 3 hours	0.8	4.8	1.6	1.9
g. Over 3 hours	5.3	0.8	0.8	1.9
7. How often were you able to complete training in the scheduled period of time?				
a. All the time	35.9	25.4	29.0	16.4
b. Approximately three-quarters of the time	48.1	50.8	48.4	56.7
c. Approximately half the time	11.4	16.4	11.3	15.4
d. Approximately one-quarter of the time	3.1	1.6	7.3	8.6
e. Never	1.5	5.7	4.0	2.9
8. This unit's trainee performance level is:				
a. Very acceptable	11.4	17.6	23.8	17.9
b. Acceptable	56.8	52.0	53.2	58.5
c. Somewhat acceptable	25.0	26.4	21.4	20.7
d. Unacceptable	3.8	1.6	1.6	2.8
e. Very unacceptable	3.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
9. The relationship between you and your trainees is:				
a. Very satisfactory	22.0	32.8	42.9	42.9
b. Satisfactory	65.2	64.0	52.4	52.4
c. Borderline	9.8	3.2	4.8	2.9
d. Unsatisfactory	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.9
e. Very unsatisfactory	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table A-3 (Cont'd)

Question	7th week		12th week	
	TSI	OSUT	TSI	OSUT
10. The individual performance of my immediate chain of command is:				
a. Very satisfactory	39.4	32.8	37.3	31.4
b. Satisfactory	40.9	51.2	44.4	51.4
c. Borderline	15.2	13.6	13.5	14.3
d. Unsatisfactory	3.8	2.4	4.8	1.9
e. Very unsatisfactory	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.9
11. When discussing their jobs, other cadre, on the average, indicate they are:				
a. Very satisfied	9.2	6.4	11.1	8.4
b. Satisfied	32.8	44.8	42.1	46.7
c. Borderline	32.1	27.2	20.6	23.4
d. Unsatisfied	20.6	19.2	16.7	18.7
e. Very unsatisfied	5.3	2.4	9.5	2.8
12. Since initiating the present training program my own attitude has been:				
a. Very satisfactory	8.3	16.0	23.2	11.2
b. Satisfactory	43.2	48.0	44.0	49.5
c. Borderline	31.8	27.2	23.2	29.0
d. Unsatisfactory	9.1	6.4	7.2	6.5
e. Very unsatisfactory	7.6	2.4	2.4	3.7
13. Obeying regulations and SOP's:				
a. Always are more important than getting the job done	24.2	21.1	22.2	22.6
b. Usually are more important than getting the job done	37.9	37.4	30.9	47.2
c. Borderline	25.8	28.5	30.2	15.1
d. Usually are less important than getting the job done	10.6	10.6	16.7	11.3
e. Always are less important than getting the job done	1.5	2.4	0.0	3.8
14. The Army's expectations regarding its trainees are:				
a. Much too high	26.0	23.4	22.4	24.5
b. Too high	18.3	26.6	20.0	26.4
c. About right	22.9	20.2	27.2	25.5
d. Too low	17.6	16.9	26.4	16.8
e. Much too low	15.3	12.9	4.0	7.5

Table A-3 (Cont'd)

question	7th week		12th week	
	1ST Phase 1 OSUT	1ST Phase 2 OSUT	1ST Phase 2 OSUT	1ST Phase 2 OSUT
15. Individual cadre problems:				
a. Always discuss training problems with each other	50.0	56.0	49.2	43.4
b. Usually discuss training problems with each other	41.7	40.0	40.5	50.9
c. Borderline	4.5	3.2	7.9	3.8
d. Usually hide training problems from each other	3.8	0.8	0.8	1.9
e. Always hide training problems from each other	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0
16. I:				
a. Always discuss training problems with other cadre	54.6	47.6	59.2	44.3
b. Usually discuss training problems with other cadre	41.7	46.8	33.6	47.2
c. Borderline	3.0	5.6	4.8	6.6
d. Usually hide training problems from other cadre	0.8	0.0	2.4	1.9
e. Always hide training problems from other cadre	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
17. I am:				
a. Always encouraged to think and act for myself	54.6	41.8	51.6	34.0
b. Usually encouraged to think and act for myself	17.4	27.9	19.4	25.5
c. Encouraged to think and act for myself about half the time	12.9	19.7	10.5	21.7
d. Rarely encouraged to think and act for myself	12.1	8.2	11.3	15.1
e. Never encouraged to think and act for myself	3.0	2.5	7.3	3.8
18. The amount of hours we spend working are:				
a. Way too much	38.6	38.5	39.7	44.3
b. Too much	34.1	39.3	38.9	35.8
c. About right	25.0	20.5	21.4	19.8
d. Too little	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
e. Way too little	0.8	1.6	0.0	0.0
19. Cycle breaks occur:				
a. Way too early	1.6	1.7	0.8	4.7
b. Too early	8.6	2.6	3.3	2.8
c. About right	55.5	47.9	69.1	35.8
d. Too late	13.3	24.8	8.1	34.0
e. Way too late	21.1	23.1	18.7	22.6

**Appendix B**

**Statistical Analyses**

TABLE B-1  
 TRAINEE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES  
 Thirty-one Item Questionnaire  
 (p values)

Question #	OSUT/TST Comparisons			Trend Analysis	
	3d Week	6th Week	11th Week	OSUT	TST
*1	.1032	.0522	.8250	.0052	.0025
2	.5558	.0918	.0311	.0001	.0000
3	.2033	.5446	.1884	.0000	.0000
4	.7943	.4877	.8671	.0511	.1129
5	.3297	.1445	.3050	.0000	.0247
6	.3539	.4141	.0895	.0378	.4112
7	.7790	.1823	.5416	.7808	.0562
8	.8781	.0810	.8129	.1529	.0106
9	.0673	.0055	.0005	.0001	.5404
10	.0492	.0200	.1513	.0000	.0005
11	.0994	.0994	.0327	.0067	.0372
12	.1642	.7845	.0000	.0000	.2070
13	.8607	.9904	.4917	.0006	.2511
14	.4612	.6527	.0007	.0021	.2081
15	.1111	.2490	.0369	.0000	.0000
16	.7495	.2963	.0000	.0000	.2912
17	.0379	.0047	.0000	.0000	.0355
*18	.0000	.0069	.0015	.0000	.0000
19	.0056	.7651	.0000	.2769	.0000
*20	.0929	.5574	.0060	.0456	.0000
21	.5991	.2746	.0000	.0000	.0000
22	.4547	.5461	.0002	.0071	.0210
23	.0537	.1845	.1208	.5887	.0002
24	.2165	.0129	.0001	.5460	.0002
25	.6661	.4141	.0012	.2365	.0918
26	.0139	.0014	.0028	.0000	.1865
27	.3219	.0471	.2189	.0361	.1866
28	.7613	.2349	.0030	.1366	.0694
29	.4461	.0005	.2827	.0000	.0000
30	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000
31	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0102	.0000

\*Questions eliminated from discussion

TABLE B-2  
TRAINEE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES  
Seven Item Questionnaire  
(p values)

Question #

1	.0029
2	.0002
3	.0000
4	.1213
5	.8889
6	.8279
7	.3488

TABLE B-3  
CADRE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES  
(p values)

Question #	OSUT/TST Comparisons		Trend Analysis	
	Phase 1	Phase 2	TST	OSUT
1	.0036	.3748	.0029	.9176
2	.5674	.0801	.1740	.7294
3	.3401	.7263	.3340	.7590
4	.0021	.0000	.0945	.4916
5	.3448	.1117	.2972	.3447
6	.0107	.0379	.2830	.0805
7	.1288	.2192	.3325	.0544
8	.5123	.6455	.0244	.3853
9	.0282	.4020	.0023	.1538
10	.4476	.4433	.8294	.8600
11	.2886	.2769	.1396	.9459
12	.0947	.1857	.0058	.8453
13	.9486	.0038	.2760	.1792
14	.6237	.2548	.0215	.6728
15	.3569	.2244	.2141	.2706
16	.4009	.1403	.3945	.4649
17	.0898	.0214	.5859	.4289
18	.5076	.7737	.4565	.4937
19	.0612	.0000	.1416	.2739

DISTRIBUTION

- 1 US ARMY WESTERN COMMAND ATTN: APPE
- 1 HQDA ATTN: DAAG-EII
- 1 HQ, ICATA ATTN: AICAT-OPU
- 2 HQDA RESEARCH AND STUDIES OFC
- 1 MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DIV DAPO-MSP-U, RM 8520 HOFFMAN BLDG 1
- 4 NSAS (MRA AND LI)
- 1 HQDA DDCSPFH
- 1 HEADQUARTERS, US MARINE CORPS ATTN: CODE MPI-20
- 2 US ARMY EUROPE AND SEVENTH ARMY
- 2 HQ TRADOC TECHNICAL LIBRARY
- 1 MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE ATTN: ATZI-NCH-MS-M, RM 3N33 HOFFMAN BLDG 11
- 1 DATA ANALYSIS DIVISION ATTN: ATZI-NCR-MB, HOFFMAN BLDG 11
- 1 HQDA ARMY FORCE MODERNIZATION COORDINATION OFFICE
- 1 123D USAHLCM R-SERVE CENTER
- 1 US ARMY SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER ATTN: ATSG-HUD (DR. CAVINESS)
- 1 DIRECTORATE OF TRAINING ATTN: ATZU-T
- 1 DIRECTORATE OF COMBAT DEVELOPMENTS ATTN: ATZU-D
- 1 HQARCOM MARINE CORPS LIAISON OFC
- 1 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY US ARMY INTELLIGENCE + SECURITY COMMAND
- 1 ARTANS ATTN: DDCPM-TDS-TU
- 1 USA FORCES COMMAND
- 1 US MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON OFC OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
- 1 NAVAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL COMD SOUTHERN FLD DIV
- 20 ART LIAISON OFFICE
- 1 7TH ARMY TRAINING COMMAND
- 1 HQDA, UGS STUDY OFFICE
- 1 U.S. NAVY TRAINING ANALYSIS EVALUATION GROUP
- 1 USACDEC ATTN: ATEC-EX-E HUMAN FACTORS
- 1 INTEN-UNIV SEMINAR ON ARMED FORCES + SOC
- 1 NASA (HQA) DEPTY FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
- 1 OFC OF NAVAL RESEARCH /
- 1 AFMRI/LRT
- 1 AFMRI/LRLG
- 1 NAVY PERSONNEL R AND D CENTER DIRECTOR OF PROGRAMS
- 2 OFC OF NAVAL RESEARCH PERSONNEL AND TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAMS
- 1 NAVAL PERSONNEL R + D CENTER /
- 1 DEPT. OF NATIONAL DEFENCE DEFENCE AND CIVIL INSTITUTE OF ENVIR MED
- 1 NAVAL AEROSPACE MEDICAL RSCH LAB AEROSPACE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
- 1 USA TRADOC SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY ATTN: ATAA-TCA
- 1 HEADQUARTERS, COAST GUARD CHIEF, PSYCHOLOGICAL RSCH RR
- 1 USA TRAINING HQAD ATTN: ATTG-ATB-TA
- 1 USA MATERIAL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY ATTN: DRXSY-C
- 1 BATTLE-ELLI-COLUMBUS LABORATORIES TACTICAL TECHNICAL OFC
- 1 USA GOLD REGIONS TEST CEN ATTN: STECR-OP
- 1 HQ WRAIR DIV OF NEUROPSYCHIATRY
- 1 USA RSCH DEVEL + STANDARDIZA GP, U.K.
- 1 HQDA /
- 1 USAHL LIBRARY
- 1 SEVILLE RESEARCH CORPORATION
- 1 USA TRADOC SYSTEMS ANALYSIS ACTIVITY ATTN: ATAA-TSL (TECH LIBRARY)
- 1 UNINFORMED SERVICES UNIT OF THE HEALTH SCI DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY
- 1 GRUNINGER LIBRARY ATTN: ATZFD-DSL BLDG 1313
- 1 CTR FOR NAVAL ANALYSIS
- 1 NAVAL PERSONNEL R AND D CEN LIBRARY ATTN: CODE P106
- 1 USA ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENCES STIMSON LIBRARY (DOCUMENTS)
- 1 SCHOOL OF SYSTEMS AND LOGISTICS /
- 1 DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY TRAINING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION GP
- 1 NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS /
- 1 USMA DEPT OF BEHAVIORAL SCI AND LEADERSHIP
- 1 OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT LABORATORY
- 1 USA COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE ATTN: LIBRARY

1 USA TRANSPORTATION SCHOOL USA TRANSP TECH INFO AND RSCH CEN  
1 USA ADMINCN TECHNICAL RESEARCH BRANCH LIBRARY  
1 USA FIELD ARTY HQ /  
1 NAT LEARNINGHOUSE FOR MENTAL HEALTH INFO PARKLAWN BLDG  
1 U OF TEXAS CEN FOR COMMUNICATION RSCH  
1 INSTITUTE FOR OFFENSE ANALYSES  
1 USA TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER ATTN: ATIC-IST-PA  
1 USA MOBILITY EQUIPMENT R AND D COMMAND ATTN: DRUME-ZG  
1 DA US ARMY RESEARCH AND EVALUATION DIVISION  
1 USA AEROMEDICAL RESEARCH LAB SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION CENTER  
1 US MILITARY ACADEMY DEPT. OF HISTORY BLDG 601  
1 MARINE CORPS INSTITUTE  
1 USAAVNG AND FT. RUCKER ATTN: ATZU-ES  
1 US MILITARY ACADEMY DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RSCH  
1 USAAMS-LIBRARY-DOCUMENTS  
1 USA INTELLIGENCE CEN AND SCH ATTN: ATSI-DOTU-SF  
1 USA ARMOR SCHOOL ATTN: ATZK-TD  
1 NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCH ATTN: DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY (CONF 1424)  
1 USA TRANSPORTATION SCHOOL DEPUTY ASST. COMMANDANT EDUC. TECHNOLOGY  
1 USA SIGNAL SCHOOL AND FT. GORDON ATTN: ATZH-ET  
1 USA ARMOR CENTER + FT. KNOX OFFICE OF ARMOR FORCE MGT + STANDARDIZATION  
1 USA SIGNAL SCHOOL + FT. GORDON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY DIVISION  
1 HQ ATC/XPTD TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT  
1 US ARMY ARMOR CENTER ATTN: ATZK-TD-PMO  
1 USA QUARTERMASTER SCHOOL DIRECTORATE OF TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS  
1 US COAST GUARD ACADEMY /  
1 USA TRANSPORTATION SCHOOL DIRECTORATE OF TRAINING + DOCTRINE  
1 USA INFANTRY SCHOOL LIBRARY /  
1 USA MP + CHEM SCH/TNG CEN + FT. MCCLELLAN ATTN: ATZN-PTS  
1 USA MP + CHEM SCH/TNG CEN + FT. MCCLELLAN DIR. COMBAT DEVELOPMENT  
1 USA MP + CHEM SCH/TNG CEN + FT. MCCLELLAN DIR. TRAINING DEVELOPMENT  
1 USA MP + CHEM SCH/TNG CEN + FT. MCCLELLAN ATTN: ATZN-MP-ACE  
1 USA INSTITUTE OF ADMINISTRATION ATTN: RESIDENT TRAINING MANAGEMENT  
1 USA FIELD ARTILLERY SCHOOL MORRIS SWETT LIBRARY  
1 USA INSTITUTE OF ADMINISTRATION ACADEMIC LIBRARY  
1 USA ENGINEER SCHOOL LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER  
1 USA ARMOR SCHOOL (USARMS) ATTN: LIBRARY  
1 US ARMY INTELLIGENCE CENTER + SCHOOL ATTN: ATSI-TD  
1 DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AIR UNIVERSITY LIBRARY (ATC)  
1 HQ THAILOC TRAINING DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE  
2 BRITISH EMBASSY BRITISH DEFENCE STAFF  
2 CANADIAN JOINT STAFF  
1 COIS (W) LIBRARY  
1 FRENCH ARMY ATTACHE  
1 AUSTRIAN EMBASSY DEFENSE, MILITARY AND AIR ATTACHE  
3 CANADIAN DEFENCE LIAISON STAFF ATTN: COUNSELLOR, DEFENCE R AND D  
1 ROYAL NETHERLANDS EMBASSY MILITARY ATTACHE  
2 CANADIAN FORCES PERSONNEL APPL RSCH UNIT  
1 ARMY PERSONNEL RESEARCH ESTABLISHMENT  
6 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EXCHANGE AND GIFT DIV  
1 DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CEN ATTN: DTIC-UDA-2  
140 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS UNIT DOCUMENTS EXPEDITING PROJECT  
1 US GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFC LIBRARY, PUBLIC DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT  
1 US GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFC LIBRARY AND STATUTORY, LIB DIV (SLL)  
1 THE ARMY LIBRARY ATTN: ARMY STUDIES SEC  
3 ROYAL ARMY EDUCATIONAL CAMPS CENTRE ARMY SCHOOL OF TRAINING SUPPORT